

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/974 922

Applicant(s)

GRIMBERGEN MICHAEL N

Examiner

David C. Meyer

Art Unit

2878

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel)

(1) David C. Meyer

(3) _____

(2) Joshua L. Price, applicant's rep.

(4) _____

Date of Interview 21 March 2003Type a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No

If Yes, brief description _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12, and 23Identification of prior art discussed: N/AAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached, g) ☐ was not reached, h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video-conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where recordation is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for entry to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135-1.135 U.S.C. 132.

37 CFR § 1.12, Business to be Transacted in Writing

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

1. A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted.
2. an identification of the claims discussed.
3. an identification of the specific prior art discussed.
4. an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner.
5. a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner.
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
6. a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
7. if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments. Mr. Meyer requested a phone interview after reviewing Amendment A, paper no. 4, filed on March 4, 2003. Mr. Meyer informed Mr. Price, an attorney of record, that during the initial search, patentable weight was inappropriately given the preamble of claim 1. Consequently, not all pertinent areas were searched for the pulse light drive circuit as claimed. Mr. Meyer informed Mr. Price that if left in its original form, claim 1 would be subject to additional search, and as such would not likely be allowed in the examiner's response to Amendment A.

Mr. Meyer told Mr. Price that his arguments regarding claims 12 and 23, as currently amended, were persuasive and overcame the rejections under Burns (US 4,687,539). Mr. Meyer informed Mr. Price that by amending claim 1 or by canceling claims 1-11, the application could be put in condition for allowance.

Mr. Price suggested amending claim 1 by inserting the phrase "positioned so as to direct light into a reactor chamber of a semiconductor manufacturing system" after the phrase "a pulse light source" in line 3. Mr. Meyer told Mr. Price that he would consult a Primary Examiner to determine whether the amendment was sufficient to make the claim allowable.

After consulting Primary Examiner Kevin Pyo, Mr. Meyer told Mr. Price in a subsequent phone conversation that the suggested amendment to claim 1 did not render it allowable without additional search. The reason given was that the light detector of claim 1 could be located anywhere, not only within a "reactor chamber". As such, a pulse light drive circuit, like the one claimed, simply positioned near a reactor chamber could satisfy the claim language. In claims 12 and 23, meanwhile, light detection takes place inside a reactor chamber, facilitating the monitoring of characteristics within the reactor chamber.

Mr. Meyer suggested that he respond to Amendment A, as originally filed, without the suggested amendment to claim 1, in a second office action. Additional searching would be performed as necessary, and any references cited to reject claim 1 would put the applicant in a better position to amend the claim to distinguish his invention from the prior art. Mr. Price indicated that this was satisfactory.